

REMARKS

Claims 17-21, 23-30, and 32-43 are pending in the application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claims 17, 28, and 37 were amended to more clearly recite the invention. *See, e.g.*, Example 2. Claim 30 was amended to correct a typographical error.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 17-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,592,855 to Gioffre *et al.* ("Gioffre"). Applicants respectfully traverse and obviate the rejection

On page 2-3 of the Office Action, it is alleged that the present invention is anticipated by Gioffre. As the Examiner is no doubt aware, to anticipate a claim, each and every element of the claim must be disclosed in a single prior art reference. Gioffre does not disclose each and every limitation of the present invention. Specifically, Gioffre does not disclose an effervescent laundry article wherein said detergent product further comprises a perfume.

Claim 17, as amended, discloses a method of using an aluminosilicate ion exchange material for delivering effervescency in a detergent product, comprising the steps of providing an aluminosilicate ion exchange material having pores, wherein said aluminosilicate ion exchange material has a total porosity of at least 25 %; drying said aluminosilicate ion exchange material; entrapping a gas into said pores of said aluminosilicate ion exchange material; adding said aluminosilicate ion exchange material having gas entrapped therein to a detergent composition; and forming a detergent product exhibiting effervescency when said detergent product is placed in an aqueous medium, wherein said detergent product further comprises a perfume. Gioffre does not disclose or even suggest a method of using an aluminosilicate ion exchange material for delivering effervescency in a detergent product wherein the detergent product further comprises a perfume. At best, Gioffre discloses that various flavoring or sweetening agents can be incorporated into the compositions of its disclosure. *See, e.g.*, col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 15. Thus, Gioffre does not disclose each and every limitation of the claim. Because each and every element of the claim has not been disclosed in a single prior art reference, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17-22, 24-31, and 33-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over FR 891,661 to Baule ("Baule"). Applicants respectfully traverse and obviate the rejection.

On page 3 of the Office Action, it alleges that although Baule "do(es) not teach specific method steps of the present claims such as heating the zeolite prior to loading with a gas... one of ordinary skill in the art is aware the zeolite must be dried before it can effectively absorb the gas" See, Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Baule does not disclose or suggest every limitation of the present invention. Specifically, Baule does not disclose or suggest an effervescent laundry article wherein said detergent product further comprises a perfume.

Independent claims 17, 28, and 37, as amended, disclose a laundry detergent product and methods for making a laundry detergent product wherein said detergent product contains sodium carbonate. Baule does not disclose or suggest a method of using an aluminosilicate ion exchange material for delivering effervescency in a detergent product wherein the detergent product further comprises a perfume. At best, Baule discloses a aluminum silicates saturated with an alkali, such as ammonia gas, or oxygen. See, e.g., Baule, page 2, 1st paragraph. Thus, Baule does not disclose or suggest every limitation of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 28-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gioffre. Applicants respectfully traverse and obviate the rejection.

On page 4 of the Office Action, it alleges that although "Gioffre et al do not make specific mention of laundry detergents, the examiner maintains that as example 3 contains at least one builder and one surfactant commonly employed in laundry detergents, the composition of example 3 would inherently clean laundry." See, Office Action, page 4. Applicants respectfully submit that Gioffre does not disclose or suggest every limitation of the present invention. Specifically, Gioffre does not disclose or suggest an effervescent laundry article wherein said detergent product further comprises a perfume.

Independent claims 28, and 37, as amended, disclose a laundry detergent product and methods for making a laundry detergent product wherein said detergent product further

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

comprises a perfume. Gioffre does not disclose or suggest a method of using an aluminosilicate ion exchange material for delivering effervescency in a detergent product wherein the detergent product further comprises a perfume. At best, Gioffre discloses that various flavoring or sweetening agents can be incorporated into the compositions of its disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Gioffre, col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 15. Further, citric acid is taught by Gioffre as a composition of its disclosure (*See, e.g.*, Gioffre, col. 3, line 68), whereas citric acid is required to be absent from one embodiment of the present invention (*See, e.g.*, Claim 27). Thus, Gioffre does not disclose or suggest every limitation of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With regard to all claims not specifically mentioned, these are believed to be allowable not only in view of their dependency on their respective base claims and any intervening claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants to arrange for a telephonic interview in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this matter.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the amendments herein. Should any fee be required, please charge such fee to Procter & Gamble Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark A. Charles

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 51,547

Tel. No. (513) 627-4229

Dated: September 2, 2003

Customer Number: 27752

OFFICIAL**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 03 2003****BEST AVAILABLE COPY**